

gentleman from Kent that our constituents may have some interest in this matter of long or short debate. All their material interest is on the side of short debate; because we may have speeches that will cost \$700 or \$800 and our constituents must pay for them. A three hour speech costs the round sum of \$800, and I will guaranty that not one of the 800 people I represent will even read such a speech. If we were engaged upon very abstruse subjects, and they did not mind the labor imposed upon them to get at the thing contained in the speech they might do so; but big practical common sense people, and wanting their representatives to do what they have to do in the shortest practical time, I think they will prefer home speeches. If some rule can be suggested by which each county shall pay for the speeches of its own members, the question of physical endurance being out of the way, I should not care so much.

Mr. CHAMBERS. As to the enormous expense, in order to reduce it as much as possible, I will contract with the gentleman from Howard that he and I shall each forbear to write out one word of our remarks. The reporter understands condensing. That is his trade. If gentlemen will forbear to write out additional notes, it will not cost \$800 for a speech.

Mr. SANDS. I have heard of a gentleman who went to a debating society and declared he came there perfectly unprepared to say anything upon the momentous topic under consideration, and then pulled out of his pocket thirty or fifty sheets of manuscript. If that example is to be followed here, it will not be by me; for I never did write out but one speech. That was a speech before a debating society upon the question whether the British were justified in imprisoning Napoleon Bonaparte at St. Helena. That was thirty odd pages long; and I delivered it to a very large and respectable audience, composed of five boys and myself. I thought it was glory to get into the prints in a short time, that a new Demosthenes was born on the 7th of April 1829; but the world has not found it out up to this time. I never wrote out a speech again. So I am ready to agree to the contract proposed by the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers.)

Mr. CLARKE. As I had the honor of making the remarks referred to, as a speech of three hours, I wish to say that the length of time taken up yesterday was to a great extent owing to interruptions and questions put by gentlemen upon subjects brought up, not embraced within the views I had prepared. If I had followed simply the remarks as written out, I could have got through, I am sure, in one half the time. As to the remarks of the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands) with reference to that speech costing \$7 or \$8, I think the gentleman must be widely mistaken. I had no idea that they cost any

thing like that. But I will venture to say, going over the debates from the time we came here down to the present time, that it has cost more to report the remarks of the gentleman from Howard than myself, or any other member of this body.

Mr. SANDS. I should like to have that calculation made.

Mr. NEGLEY. If the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) does not know to which party he belongs, I think he is in a very awkward predicament, and I think his constituents will be very apt to call him to account. I have yet to learn that there is any ambiguity in the mind of any man as to what party he belongs to, as to the two dominant parties. There are two caucuses here. The gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers) came here and told us he belonged to no party; and the very next day or two I saw him heading a column entering into the Senate Chamber, I believe on a caucus. I think the gentleman from Baltimore city was among the first to come into this hall to attend another caucus. I do not think there are any gentlemen in this House who do not belong either to the majority or to the minority. I think the status of every man here is fully fixed in his own mind, and in the mind of every other member.

I think it is perfectly fair and legitimate that the speeches should have an end, and that whenever a speech from the minority is delivered, one of the majority should follow, until the majority are exhausted, and then the minority will go on just as long as the majority chooses to let them. I have no idea that the majority ought to be put at the mercy of the minority, because they are more expert debaters, or have more confidence in themselves, or happen to catch the eye of the presiding officer more frequently, so as to give them five or six speeches before we have had one opportunity on this side of the House to make even one.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. President.

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a question of order, whether in parliamentary law this Convention knows anything about the majority or minority.

Mr. PUGH. I rose to take the same view. At the same time I wished to ask the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Negley) whether, if it should happen to be the time of one of the minority to speak, and no one should be prepared to speak, the rest of the majority who had not spoken would be deprived of the opportunity.

Mr. NEGLEY. Certainly not.

Mr. HESS raised the question of order, that the amendment was practically an amendment of Rule 27, and hence a proposition which must lie over one day.

Mr. ABBOTT stated that he had withdrawn his own amendment, because he had been informed that it was unparliamentary.